

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 274

CS 501 262

AUTHOR Melching, William H.; Whitmore, Paul G.
TITLE The Effect of Special Oracy Instruction on the Oracy Skills of Primary Level Students. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Human Resources Research Organization, Alexandria, Va.
SPONS AGENCY River Rouge Public Schools, Mich.
REPORT NO WD-CR-75-24
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 56p.; Occasional light print

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Audiolingual Methods; *Audiolingual Skills; Elementary Education; Listening Skills; *Literacy; Speaking; Speech Skills; Teacher Workshops

ABSTRACT

Based on the rationale that improved literacy skills in children can be most effectively obtained by first improving their oracy skills (auding and speaking), a special oracy instructional program was developed consisting of a workshop to train teachers in teaching oracy skills, sets of structured stimulus materials for use by teachers in teaching oracy skills, and an oracy test to assess the oracy capabilities of students. The program was administered during the 1974-75 school year to selected primary level teachers and students of the River Rouge, Michigan, School District. An oracy test was administered to project and control students before program implementation and as a posttest upon completion of the program. Oracy test results showed that the instructional program was an effective means for improving oracy skills of students.
(Author/JM)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED119274

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

Final Report WD-CA-75-24

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE EFFECT OF SPECIAL ORACY INSTRUCTION ON
THE ORACY SKILLS OF PRIMARY LEVEL STUDENTS

William H. Melching
Paul G. Whitmore

Human Resources Research Organization
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

October 1975

Prepared for:

School District of the City of River Rouge
1411 Coolidge Highway
River Rouge, Michigan 48218

CS 501 262

ABSTRACT

Based on the rationale that improved literacy skills in children can be most effectively obtained by first improving their oracy skills (auding and speaking), a special oracy instructional program was developed. This program consisted of (1) a workshop to train teachers in teaching oracy skills, (2) sets of structured stimulus materials for use by teachers in teaching oracy skills, and (3) an oracy test to assess the oracy capabilities of students. The program was administered during school year 1974-75 to selected primary level teachers and students of the River Rouge, Michigan School District. An oracy test was administered to project and control students before program implementation, and the same test was administered as a posttest upon completion of the program. Oracy test results showed that the instructional program was an effective means for improving oracy skills of students.

KEY WORDS

Auding
Literacy skills
Oracy skills

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The School District of the City of River Rouge wished to improve the oral language and literacy capabilities of its students, especially those in the elementary grades. Based on the observation that children acquire oracy skills (auding and speaking) before literacy skills, it may be concluded that an optimal instructional program for improving literacy skills should proceed in the oracy-literacy direction. The purpose of the present study, therefore, was to examine the effects of oracy instruction on the oracy skills of primary level children.

APPROACH

Following the rationale cited above, a special oracy instructional program was developed. This program consisted of three separate parts.

1. Workshop for teachers. This workshop was designed to train teachers to be more effective in helping students acquire oracy skills. After supervised practice over a school year, they should become "model" oracy teachers, able to help both students and other teachers acquire needed oracy skills.

2. Highly structured stimulus materials. It was believed that teachers would more confidently conduct oracy instruction if useful oracy teaching materials were available in ample supply. Such materials were constructed and provided to teachers.

3. Oracy test. To evaluate the effects of the oracy instruction, a special oracy test was constructed. It was administered to project students before and after they received oracy instruction, and to a large group of control students.

The workshop was administered to one grade 1 teacher and three grade 2 teachers of the River Rouge School District. These teachers then provided oracy instruction to students in their classes who, on the basis of oracy test performance, most needed help. This instruction continued throughout the school year. During the implementation period, teachers received guidance and feedback from a local program coordinator and from a member of the research team.

RESULTS

While the average oracy pretest scores of control classes were larger than project classes, the average gain scores for project

classes were larger than those of the controls. The first grade project class gained more than its control, but the difference was not statistically significant. For second grade project and control classes, an analysis of covariance of posttest scores was performed to correct for pretest differences. This analysis showed that two of the project classes had significantly higher scores than their controls, while the third did not.

CONCLUSIONS

The oracy instructional program was shown to be an effective means for improving the oracy skills of primary level students in at least 2 of 4 classes. The impact of such instruction on the literacy capabilities of students is not yet known. The administration of a reading comprehension test should be the next step in the research program.

PREFACE

This research was conducted by the Human Resources Research Organization to determine the effects of special oracy instruction on the oracy skills of primary level students. It is a part of a general rationale that seeks to improve both oracy and literacy skills through systematic oracy instruction.

This report presents the results of an oracy instructional program administered to selected teachers and students of the River Rouge, Michigan School District. The program was designed and conducted by HumRRO's Western Division of Carmel, California, with Dr. Howard H. McFann as Director. Staff members who performed the work were Dr. William H. Melching, principal investigator, and Dr. Paul G. Whitmore of HumRRO's Fort Bliss, Texas office.

Special assistance in selecting teachers and in monitoring and providing on-site guidance to them was provided by Mr. Fredric A. Rivkin, Director of Federal Projects for the River Rouge School District.

The research was conducted under contract with the River Rouge Michigan School District.

Meredith P. Crawford
President
Human Resources Research Organization

CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	1
PREFACE	3
BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM.	7
GENERAL APPROACH.	8
PROCEDURE	9
Categories of Oracy Skills	9
Development of Oracy Teaching Activities	10
Development of an Oracy Test	12
Training Teachers in the Use of Teaching Activities. . .	14
Deciding Which Teaching Activities to Use.	15
Keeping Track of Student Progress.	15
Training Aides to Administer the Oracy Test.	16
PROGRAM APPLICATION	19
Administration of Oracy Pretest.	19
Selection of Target Students	19
Conduct of Oracy Teaching Activities	20
Revision of Oracy Test	24
Administration of Oracy Posttest	25
Oracy in a Free Speech Situation	25
RESULTS	27
Oracy Test Performance	27
First Grade.	27
Second Grade	27
The Free Speech Situations	30

	Page
Some Conclusions	30

APPENDIX

A	Categories of Oracy Skills.	A-1
B	Oracy Test.	B-1
C	Oracy Examination Score Sheet	C-1

TABLE

1	Gain Scores (Posttest-Pretest).	27
2	Average Oracy Test Results for the Second Grade . .	28
3	Summary Analysis of Variance -- Pretest Scores. . .	29
4	Summary Analysis of Covariance -- Posttest Scores with Pretest Scores as the Covariate	29

BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM

An ultimate goal of the School District of the City of River Rouge is to improve the oral language and literacy capabilities of its students. Of particular interest are those elementary level students whose reading comprehension, as measured by standardized achievement tests, is below the norm, i.e., below that of comparably aged students in other schools.

In an earlier research effort by HUMRRO (Work Unit ORACY), an attack on literacy skills of children was undertaken through a special oracy program.¹ The rationale for the program was as follows. Children are born with the basic perceptual and cognitive capacities for adapting to their world, and these capacities enable them to acquire language. In this connection, it has been observed that children learn to speak and understand speech before they are able to read and write. Furthermore, ability to read is generally achieved only after children have acquired considerable oral language competency. Especially important are a vocabulary and rules of sentence structure. Since reading uses the same vocabulary and rules of structure as oral language, improving the ability of children to use and comprehend written language can be best accomplished by increasing their ability to use and comprehend oral language. Based on the observed oracy-to-literacy sequence, a language program that is directed at improving literacy skills in children should proceed in that direction, i.e., instruction should be provided in oral language skills prior to instruction in reading skills.²

Following that rationale, the ORACY staff developed a program to help primary teachers in the District learn basic knowledge and procedures to use in teaching oracy skills to their students. Test results indicated that, on the whole, teachers did learn the basic concepts and did use oracy teaching procedures in their classrooms.

It was also observed that (1) some project teachers were not putting the oracy concepts into practice, and (2) there were other

¹Literacy skills are reading and writing; oracy skills are commonly called auding and speaking.

²Sticht, Thomas G. et al., *Auding and Reading: A Developmental Model*, Human Resources Research Organization, Alexandria, VA, 1974.

teachers who had not participated in the oracy project who needed this training.

Since the results of the first year were generally positive and did not question the merit or the rationale underlying the oracy program, and since there was active interest in the District in maintaining the program, it was decided that an inservice training program should be instituted in which teachers could obtain more "intense" and sustained training. It was hoped that such a program would actively involve more reticent teachers in the effort to improve oracy skills.

GENERAL APPROACH

To enable teachers of the District to acquire an increased capability to improve oracy skills of students, a special instructional program was developed. This program, called Project ORTRAIN, was based on the same rationale that guided the previous GRACY program.

The ORTRAIN program sought to attain these three main goals:

1. Establish (train) a small corps of primary level teachers in the District who would be able to provide special instruction to students in the acquisition of oracy skills. Since there were four elementary schools, each having several primary classes, it was decided to train one teacher in each school. This training sought to make the teacher a "model" teacher of oracy skills. The teacher would then become the school "expert" in oracy instruction; she would not only teach students the desired oracy skills, but also be available to help other teachers in the school acquire oracy teaching capabilities.

To achieve this goal, a brief workshop was designed and conducted for teachers. A rationale underlying oracy instruction and some suggested classroom procedures for teaching oracy skills were treated. Reliable ways for recording the progress of students through the oracy teaching exercises were also considered.

2. Provide teachers with highly "structured" stimulus materials for the teaching of oracy skills. It was hoped that teachers might more confidently conduct oracy instruction if they had available an ample supply of already prepared teaching materials. It had been noted in the GRACY program that some teachers viewed the need to develop oracy teaching activities as burdensome; they were in favor of the program, but they were reluctant to devote the extra time needed to develop necessary teaching activities.

To achieve this goal, special materials for teaching oracy skills were prepared for use by teachers. These materials gave explicit instructions to teachers and did not require them to spend much time preparing or selecting learning activities. In addition, arrangements were made to provide frequent consultations and assistance from both a local program coordinator and a member of the research staff.

3. Evaluate effects of oracy instruction on oracy skills of students. Once the oracy teaching activities were developed and teachers were trained in their use, an evaluation of the effect of these activities on students must be undertaken. That task was the ultimate purpose of the research effort.

To achieve this goal, a special oracy test was constructed. This test was administered prior to the start of the program to groups of project and control students. At the end of the school year, the test was again administered to the students.

PROCEDURE

CATEGORIES OF ORACY SKILLS

The development of the ORTRAIN program proceeded by first defining carefully the complement of student behaviors to be established by the oracy teaching activities. To do this, a detailed examination was made of the organization and content of the existing ORACY materials. Work Unit ORACY produced an oracy notebook called PLATO--Phunctional Language Training in Oracy Skills. the PLATO notebook listed five oracy skills as major problem areas for young children. These skills were:

- A. Naming objects and events
- B. Elaborated description of objects and events
- C. Ordering and relating information about objects and events
- D. Classifying information about objects and events
- E. The social use of language

In addition, the ORTRAIN staff examined samples of published materials used for instructing primary level students in oral language skills. From these reviews, the research staff hypothesized the basic oracy behaviors or skills children must possess if they were to be able to respond to and discriminate among the kinds of stimuli present in the materials.

After considerable review and discussion by the staff, it was decided to group oracy skills into 12 categories or levels. These

categories, expressed in terms of desired student actions, are as follows:

1. Names Objects: Nouns Only
2. Describes Objects: Sensory Components
3. Describes Objects: Structural Components
4. Describes the Sensory Components of Structural Components
5. Describes Objects: Similarities
6. Describes Objects: Differences
7. Describes Objects: Spatial Relations
8. Describes Objects as Function of Who is Observing
9. Describes Objects as Function of Internal State of Observer
10. Describes Objects as Function of Location of Observer
11. Describes Events by Sequence
12. Uses Language in a Social Sense.

The categories are arranged approximately in ascending order of difficulty or complexity, although some skills would seem to fit at various places in the sequence. The final category is most complex, and it also represents the terminal oracy behavior that is desired.

A statement of each of the 12 categories, expressed in the form of an objective, appears in Appendix A. Additionally, the appendix includes two representative test items for each category, one to evaluate auditing and one to evaluate speaking. These objectives guided the subsequent development of teaching activities and test items.

As an example, the objective and representative test items for the first oracy skill category are given below.

1. Names Objects: Nouns Only

Given a group of objects (or pictures or models) common in the child's environment, the child will:

- a. Point to an object when it is named by a single noun.
Example: "Point to a car."
- b. Name an object with a single noun when it is pointed out.
Example: "What do you call this?"

DEVELOPMENT OF ORACY TEACHING ACTIVITIES

Because they were rich in illustrations that were conducive to eliciting various oracy behaviors, two publications were used as basic sources for developing the teaching activities. Published in 1973 by Harper & Row, Publishers, they are entitled *New Directions in English: All About You* and *New Directions in English: Backgrounds and Beginnings*.

The teacher's editions of these books were available for use by all primary teachers in the District, and all primary teachers used them in their regular language development program. Such use in no way interfered with or conflicted with their intended use in the oracy training program.

In selecting illustrations about which to build oracy teaching activities, the two books were reviewed first to judge the oracy category into which each illustration fell. Of course, those illustrations that did not clearly fit any category were rejected. The product of this effort was, for each book, a list of pages opposite each of the 12 oracy categories. From this population of pages, explicit oracy teaching activities were developed.

These teaching activities were developed by the research staff prior to the conduct of the teacher workshop. It was intended to present teachers at the workshop with a large sample of activities, at which time they would review and change them as seemed necessary.

Two typical teaching activities are shown below. Each activity indicates the oracy category by number and title, which book is involved, the page number, kind of oracy behavior (auding or speaking), and specific things the teacher is to do in conducting the exercise.

SAMPLE TEACHING ACTIVITY

2. Describes Objects: Sensory Components

New Directions in English

Background and Beginnings

P. 4 and P. 5

Auding (Shape: Common Analogies)

Show the child the pictures.

Questions: "Which of these is round like a ball?"

"Which of these is square like a box?"

"What of these has 3 sides like a triangle?"

SAMPLE TEACHING ACTIVITY

3. Describes Objects: Structural Components

New Directions in English

All About You

P. 20

Speaking (Structural Component Parts)

Show the child the picture and point to each area that has a question mark beside it.

Questions: "What is this called?"

"What is the name of this?"

If the child doesn't know, give him the answer.

Other teaching activities were developed that did not require the use of these books. Some of these activities involved the use of various objects typically found in a primary classroom (e.g., chalkboard eraser, pencil, scissors, cup, etc.). Still other activities required the use of special objects that were assembled as part of an oracy test.¹ This test and the objects employed by it will be discussed in the next section.

All of these teaching activities, like the samples shown above, gave brief and explicit instructions to the teacher. This was consistent with the previously stated goal to provide teachers with sufficient structured stimulus materials and teaching activities that no developmental work would be demanded of them.

DEVELOPMENT OF AN ORACY TEST

To be able to assess the effect of an oracy instructional program on the oracy capabilities of students, it was necessary to obtain or construct an oracy test. A search of the test literature failed to locate a standardized oracy test that met criteria of importance to the District (inexpensive, relatively short time to administer, capable of being administered by teacher aides, etc.), and the development of a test was undertaken by the research staff. The test was

¹Test items were not used as teaching activities, only the test objects.

developed concurrently with the development of the oracy teaching activities.

The 12 oracy categories and their associated objectives guided the development of test items. An early goal had been to develop an equal number of items for each skill category, but this proved impracticable. Some categories seemed to elicit numerous items while others evoked only one or two. An effort was made to include an auditing and a speaking item for each category, but this too was not always adhered to.

Prior to the teacher workshop, 22 test items were prepared. There was at least one test item for each oracy skill category. Some items involved the use of objects (toy cars, toy airplanes, blocks, and balls), and some involved pictures or drawings of objects and scenes. In general, each item stated the materials that were needed to administer it, the procedures to be followed in administering it, and how the item should be scored. Special effort was made to keep scoring objective, but some subjective aspects were bound to be present.

The items were reviewed carefully by the project teachers at the workshop, and they made minor changes in content and scoring. In addition, because the teachers and staff felt that the test had insufficient, "top," four new items were developed, making a total of 26. Two of these items were open-ended in terms of number of points that might be earned.

Once the items were agreed upon by the research staff and the teachers, eight teacher aides were assigned the task of obtaining objects and mounting pictures needed to administer the test. These aides were in attendance at the teacher workshop. All were to be trained to administer the oracy test, first at the beginning of the school year, and again at the end of the year. In addition, four of these aides were hired to assist the four project teachers during the year in their efforts to implement the ORTRAIN program. Aides were not to provide oracy instruction; they were to assist the teacher in other activities, thereby freeing her for conducting oracy instruction.

As will be reported in a subsequent section, the oracy test was revised after its initial use, and 11 items were discarded. The final 15 items comprising this test are found in Appendix B. As a sample, the first item is given below.

Item 1, Skill 1; Names Objects: Nouns Only

Materials: (3 cars, 3 airplanes, 3 blocks, 3 balls) Lay the objects in a scrambled arrangement in front of the child.

Speaking

Ask the child to name a class of objects to which you point.

Point to one of the airplanes and ask: "What is this?"

If the child does not name the object correctly, tell him the correct name. "This is an airplane." Then go on to the next class of objects.

If the child names the object correctly, point to another object in the same class—another airplane. If he is correct again, then go on to the third object in the class. If he is not correct, then go on to the next class of objects.

Repeat the above procedure for two more classes of objects.

Scoring. One point for each object class correctly named by the child. However, the child must name all 3 members of the class correctly in order to receive the 1 point credit.

TRAINING TEACHERS IN THE USE OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES

While the aides prepared the stimulus materials for the oracy test items, the teachers reviewed the teaching activities. They modified and discarded certain activities and then ordered the remaining exercises of each oracy category according to their presumed difficulty level. They also prepared several new teaching activities.

Before considering possible classroom practices in teaching oracy skills, a discussion of the rationale underlying oracy instruction was conducted. This discussion emphasized certain key assumptions:

1. Children are born with basic perceptual and cognitive capacities for adapting to their world.
2. These capacities enable them to acquire language, both oral and written.
3. Oral language capabilities are acquired first.
4. Ability to read is achieved only after an oral vocabulary is established and rules of sentence structure are present.

5. Reading uses the same vocabulary and rules of structure as oral language.
6. Improving the ability of children to use and comprehend written language can be best accomplished by increasing their ability to use and comprehend oral language.

Since one teacher had participated in the earlier ORACY research effort, she was able to provide support for the approach as well as give examples of her experiences in teaching oracy skills. She depicted the teacher as an important source of language modeling for the child. She then described for the group how she conducted oracy training in her classroom. Other teachers were encouraged to employ practices that were consistent with their individual teaching styles. Thus, some teachers indicated that they planned to conduct instruction with groups of students (4 or 5), while others said they preferred to work with one student at a time.

Deciding Which Teaching Activities to Use

The teachers were informed that teacher aides would administer and score the oracy test and that each teacher would receive a prescription of needed instruction for each of her students. This prescription would be prepared by the local program coordinator, and it would be derived from the test results.¹ Since test items and teaching activities were based on a common set of oracy categories, the performance of a student on the test items in a given category should determine the need for instruction in that skill category. Of course, in some cases there were several test items for a single category. If a student missed all items in a category, then the use of all teaching activities for the category would be appropriate. If only one item was missed, the decision about whether to use any teaching activities for the category (as well as which activities) was left to the teacher. In general, teachers were encouraged to include teaching activities for each category in which any test errors were reported. In fact, teachers were encouraged to include teaching activities in categories in which the student made no test errors if, in their opinion, the student could benefit from such instruction.

Keeping Track of Student Progress

The need to maintain a careful record of student progress through the oracy teaching activities was discussed. Sample forms teachers

¹A sample prescription is illustrated and discussed in a subsequent section entitled CONDUCT OF ORACY TEACHING ACTIVITIES.

might use for this purpose were presented. One form dealt with individual student progress and the other with class progress.

Teachers were encouraged to develop and use other record keeping procedures if they found that the suggested ones were not adequate. Teachers agreed that, with respect to keeping track of individual student progress, the main requirement of a procedure or form was that it enable the teacher to determine easily (a) the skills in which a student was deficient, and (b) his progress in accomplishing the teaching activities associated with these skills areas. The class record should show the position of each target student in the accomplishment of the teaching activities.

TRAINING AIDES TO ADMINISTER THE ORACY TEST

The aides prepared stimulus materials for eleven copies of the oracy test, one for each of the eight aides, two for the HUMRO research staff, and one for the program coordinator. Each test copy was bound in a three-ring notebook. Test items were arranged in the notebook so that all needed materials (instructions, pictures, drawings, etc.) for an item were collocated. All objects needed for items were separately stored in a small box. Each aide was given a set of these objects.

Once all materials were assembled, the aides were instructed in the procedures they were to follow in administering the test. Since they had participated directly in locating many of the stimulus materials, administration of the test would require them to work with materials with which they were already acquainted. They now needed to learn how to use the materials in connection with specially prepared written test instructions. They were then directed to read carefully the instructions that were prepared for each test item. The workshop instructor answered questions about items (procedure, scoring, etc.) and emphasized the need to follow instructions exactly. Where aides thought instructions were not clear, changes were made. Special attention was devoted to the control of prompting. To reduce or prevent the need for prompting by aides, the first test items were made to be particularly easy. Both the teachers and the research staff felt that even the least capable child could get started without prompting.

After the test instructions for each item had been reviewed by the aides, they were then directed to practice administering the items, using each other as students. To help them get started, some general hints about role playing were given. Also, forms on which to record the student's test performance were provided. A copy of this form appears as Appendix C. After aides took turns administering and receiving the test, new questions about procedure and scoring arose, and various solutions were offered. Aides were informed that, during

the first few days of the actual test administration, both a HumRRO researcher and the program coordinator would be present to help them resolve problems.

Immediately prior to administering the oracy test to project and control students, aides were given an opportunity to practice administering the test to a group of first grade students. These students were not scheduled to be part of the program. At this time, each aide administered the test to at least one student. A HumRRO researcher was present during the practice period, and he provided feedback and assistance to aides in their administration of the test.

PROGRAM APPLICATION

ADMINISTRATION OF ORACY PRETEST

Of the four teachers who volunteered to participate in the project, one taught grade 1, and three taught grade 2. In September 1974, the oracy test was administered to all students in the four project classrooms and to a random selection of students in comparable level classrooms. The latter classes were sources of control students. Thus, in the school where a project teacher taught grade 1, another grade 1 class was designated as a control. Similarly, in the remaining schools where project teachers taught grade 2, other grade 2 classes were selected as sources of control students.

In two schools, several grade 2 classes were in existence, and the test was administered to students in all of these classes. Teachers of control classes were asked to make ten or so students from each class available for the test. The students were to be chosen randomly so that all levels of oracy skills might be represented. There was no intent to employ as control students only those of one oracy level capability.

During the previous practice administration of the oracy test by the aides, it was clear that administration of the entire set of items at one sitting would surely tire the student, and make the results suspect. Therefore, aides were instructed to monitor the child carefully and if attention appeared to be waning, to discontinue the test. At no time were aides to spend more than 20 minutes in testing a child. As a result, some test administrations required three different sessions to complete the entire test. These sessions were generally one or two days apart. Administration of the test to all classes required two weeks.

SELECTION OF TARGET STUDENTS

During the first two weeks of school year 1974-75, each project teacher was instructed to begin identifying 15 or so students (about half of her class) who, in her opinion, were weak in oracy skills and could most likely benefit from oracy instruction. The performance of students on the oracy test was to be the primary source of information, but she was not limited to it. The program coordinator assisted teachers in the selection of target students, but the final selection was left to the teacher. In most classes, target students were identified and ready for oracy instruction by mid-October 1974.

CONDUCT OF ORACY TEACHING ACTIVITIES

To help each teacher decide where to begin oracy instruction for students, a report of the performance of each target student on the oracy pretest was provided. This report showed the oracy skill categories in which the student had made errors. Thus, it served to prescribe the kinds of oracy teaching activities that would be appropriate for the student.

A copy of a hypothetical prescription is shown on the next page. It shows that the student missed test items 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 13, and 15. The skill areas associated with these test items are the areas in which the student should be administered oracy teaching activities. As discussed earlier, in skill areas where a student missed some but not all test items (see skill area 5 in the example), the decision about which teaching activities to use was left to the teacher. However, she was encouraged to use all activities for the area even if only one test error was reported.

Another aspect of the sample prescription record should be commented upon. Skill categories 4 and 9 have no test items; thus, the test gives no information about student performance in these areas. In the original oracy test, items for these areas were included. However, as will be discussed in the next section, because it was subsequently found that students performed so well on these items, they were deleted from the final oracy test. The decision about instruction in these areas was left to the teacher. Since each of these two areas has only two teaching activities, the decision to include or exclude is not a major one, and the activities are not likely to have much of an impact on the student's final oracy skill.

After receiving the several prescription forms for her class, each teacher began oracy instruction. All teachers tried to allot at least 20 minutes each day for such instruction. Two of the teachers provided oracy instruction to target students in groups of 4 or 5, while the other two conducted instruction with only one student at a time.¹ Each teacher was permitted to schedule the oracy instruction at a time convenient to her, but she was requested to develop a stable schedule so that she could be monitored easily and frequently by the program coordinator.

The coordinator visited each teacher an average of about once a week, always during the time that oracy instruction was scheduled.

¹While aides did not conduct oracy instruction, they served to model language in their interactions with students.

INDIVIDUAL ORACY SKILL RECORD

PUPIL John Jones TEACHER Jane Doe

TEST ITEMS	TEACHING ACTIVITIES	DATE COMPLETE	COMMENTS																						
	SKILL 1																								
1	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B																						
A	B																								
	SKILL 2																								
2, 3	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>D</td><td>E</td><td>F</td><td>G</td><td>H</td><td>I</td><td>J</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J														
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J																
	SKILL 3																								
4	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>D</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B	C	D																				
A	B	C	D																						
	SKILL 4																								
	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B																						
A	B																								
	SKILL 5																								
5, 6, 7	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>D</td><td>E</td><td>F</td><td>G</td><td>H</td><td>I</td><td>J</td><td>K</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K													
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K															
	SKILL 6																								
8	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>D</td><td>E</td><td>F</td><td>G</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G																	
A	B	C	D	E	F	G																			
	SKILL 7																								
9, 10	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>C</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B	C																					
A	B	C																							
	SKILL 8																								
11	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>C</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B	C																					
A	B	C																							
	SKILL 9																								
	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B																						
A	B																								
	SKILL 10																								
12	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>D</td><td>E</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B	C	D	E																			
A	B	C	D	E																					
	SKILL 11																								
13	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>D</td><td>E</td><td>F</td><td>G</td><td>H</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H																
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H																		
	SKILL 12																								
14, 15	<table><tr><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>D</td><td>E</td><td>F</td><td>G</td><td>H</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H																
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H																		

○ = ITEM MISSED

He discussed with the teacher problems she might be experiencing, and he also provided her a copy of any notes he might have made as he observed her performance. Thus, she received immediate feedback and guidance. A member of the research staff visited each teacher twice during the school year and observed her as she conducted oracy instruction. He noted her teaching procedures, answered questions that she posed, offered suggestions, and otherwise tried to help her employ effective oracy teaching practices. An early problem, for example, was the failure by some teachers to reinforce students appropriately for correct response. The researcher provided each teacher with concrete examples of possible reinforcers, and then observed her subsequent performance to make sure that she used the technique correctly.

In general, teachers were encouraged to complete (i.e., achieve student mastery on) each teaching activity before shifting to another. However, they were advised to shift to a new activity even if the student had not mastered the present one if the student appeared stumped and temporarily unable to progress. The same recommendation was made with respect to completing skill areas.

During the year teachers developed various forms for keeping track of the progress of a class and each student in it. One form finally came to be most preferred by teachers. A copy of a portion of that form is shown on the next page. Names of students are listed vertically on the left side and oracy skills by number across the top. Each skill is further divided into the teaching activities available for it. In the form included in this report, only four oracy skill categories are given because of space limitations. The actual form included all 12 categories.

A simple code for recording student progress is on the bottom of the form. The blacked-out areas denote skills in which students do not need to undertake instruction. Thus, because of acceptable oracy pretest performance, none of the students on the list needed to complete the teaching activities of skill #1. The record shows that students have made varying progress in accomplishing teaching activities of skill #2. John V. has completed all of them successfully, while the other two students have been successful on 2 or 3 activities and unsuccessful on 2 others. Only Sandy I. must complete activities in skill #3, and no work has begun as yet. In skill #4, John V. has successfully completed activity A. No other work has been attempted. Each teacher maintained a record like this for each target student in her class.

Teachers completed as many teaching activities for a student as that student was able to undertake and master. One teacher reported that she was able to administer all the activities prescribed for each of her students. Other teachers indicated that they attempted nearly

CLASS PROGRESS SHEET

	TEACHING SKILL #1			TEACHING SKILL #2									TEACHING SKILL #3				TEACHING SKILL #4	
	A	B	C	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	A	B	C	D	A	B
Timothy R.				X	X	X	X	X										
Sandy I.				X	X	X	X	X										
John V.				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	



= Does not need to undertake the activity.



= Has successfully completed the activity.



= Has attempted an activity but has not been successful.



= Has not yet attempted the activity.

all of the activities prescribed for each student, but some students were not able to master them all.

REVISION OF ORACY TEST

After the oracy pretest had been administered, the records scored, individual prescriptions prepared, and teaching activities initiated, the oracy test and its results were carefully reviewed to determine which items should be retained and which discarded. The main criterion for making this decision was to be the size of the variance of each item. To obtain this, the performance of all students, control and target, on each item was recorded and the mean, standard deviation, and variance calculated.

Actually, simple inspection of the test records showed that on several items, students made very few errors. Therefore, it was easy to see that these items had little variance. However, to be thorough, the variance was calculated on each item.

As a result of this calculation, items with the lowest variances were marked for possible deletion. Before this action was taken, however, other considerations were entertained. For example, while the first three test items showed practically zero variance, these items were believed to be important in establishing rapport between the student and the test. Therefore, one of these items was retained, two were discarded. Other items, although relatively low in variance, sampled oracy skills that otherwise would not be assessed. Therefore, they were retained.

At the opposite end, it appeared that some items had unduly high variances. These items were examined to determine if their scores could be reduced, thereby lowering their variances. In only one item, however, were the scores large enough to permit this action. On this item scores were cut in half. The other high-variance items were retained without modification.

As a result of these operations, 11 items were discarded, and 15 were retained. The variance of each of the 15 retained items is shown below.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Variance</u>
1	.06	9	1.91
2	1.54	10	3.16
3	.82	11	1.85
4	.26	12	2.21
5	1.04	13	.37
6	4.02	14	.94
7	1.44	15	1.80
8	.64		

After these changes in the oracy test were made, items were renumbered and the pretest score of each target and control student was recalculated. All subsequent oracy test score comparisons were based on scores of students on the revised oracy test.

ADMINISTRATION OF ORACY POSTTEST

Approximately two weeks before the end of the 1974-75 school year, the revised oracy test was administered as a posttest by the aides to target and control students. The procedures were the same as before, but since the number of test items was much less, fewer testing sessions were required for a single student and less time was needed to test an entire class.

Some students who had participated during the time of the pretest were no longer in school at posttest time, thereby reducing the number of students for whom both pre- and posttest scores were possible. Students for whom only pretest scores were available were not included in the subsequent analysis of the data.

ORACY IN A FREE SPEECH SITUATION

The oracy test was designed to measure separate components of oracy performance such as naming objects, describing objects, describing events, and so forth. It was felt desirable to have an oracy measure obtained in a speech situation more nearly resembling a real life situation; that is, one in which the child could generate speech freely about some broad topic. Two approaches were tried. In both approaches, simulated telephone conversations between the examiner and each child were recorded on audio tape.

The first approach, tried early in the school year, asked the child to describe how to make a telephone call. Scoring was accomplished by listing all the separate events mentioned by any of the children to whom the test was administered and crediting each child with one point for each mentioned event. The results showed that a total of thirty different events were mentioned by all the children. However, the most number of events mentioned by any one child was seven. The fewest number of events mentioned by any one child was zero.

Performance in the first approach was probably influenced to a substantial degree by the child's experience in using the telephone. Thus, it would not appear to be a pure test of oracy skill.

In the second approach, used late in the school year, the child was given a toy telephone and asked to call someone. The examiner

played the part of the other person. Scoring was more complex in this approach. First, the number of response opportunities (RO) provided to the child by the examiner were counted. A response opportunity was most often a leading question. The child's response could either be a minimum response (MR) or an elaborated response (ER). A minimum response was the very least a child could reply, and it earned no points. Anything else was an elaborated response. Examples of an MR and an ER are these:

RO: "What did you do today?"

MR: "Nothing."

ER: "I didn't do nothing--just played."

The basic score (BS) consisted of the proportion of elaborated responses (ER) given by the child to the total number of response opportunities provided by the examiner. This proportion can range from zero to one.

Each time a child asked a question (Q) or introduced a topic (IT) into the conversation, he was given 0.1 point to be added to his basic score (BS). Thus, a child's total score was computed as follows:

$$TS = \frac{ER}{RO} + 0.1N_{IT} = 0.1N_Q$$

When this procedure was applied to the data, the highest score made by a child was 1.3 and the lowest was 0.0. This scoring system would appear to be applicable to almost any free discourse situation. Since the basic score is a proportion, it takes into account differences in response opportunities provided by different examiners or by the same examiner at different times.

Each approach was tried with a small group of target children from the first and second grade project classes. The tests were administered by the teachers' aides. It was not possible to train the aides thoroughly, hence there were differences in the procedures used by different aides. Both tests were admittedly very subjective.

The reliability of the scoring procedure for the second approach is probably not wholly adequate at this time. Differentiating between a minimum and an elaborated response constitutes the major scoring problem. Providing an extended list of examples for scorers to use would help improve the reliability to an acceptable level.

RESULTS

ORACY TEST PERFORMANCE

An indication of the relative performance of project and control classes on the oracy test is shown in Table 1. This table shows the average gain score (posttest minus pretest) for each project and control class. The number of students who participated in each class is also shown.

TABLE 1. GAIN SCORES (POSTTEST-PRETEST)

		SCHOOLS ^a			
		1	2	3	4
Control	$\bar{X}$	3.81	3.39	7.94	8.53
	N	19	27	28	15
Project	$\bar{X}$	18.20	16.55	11.49	10.52
	N	15	14	12	12

^aStudents in schools 1, 2, and 3 were second graders; those in school 4 were first graders.

An immediate observation to be made is that the average gain of each project class exceeded the average gain of its control. For schools 1 and 2, the differences were sizeable. To assess the effects of the instruction more completely, the results for the first and second grades were analyzed separately.

First Grade

The pretest and posttest averages for the project class were, respectively, 36.85 and 47.37. The corresponding values for the control class were 40.50 and 49.03. Thus, while the control class started higher and ended higher, the project class actually gained more (10.52 vs. 8.53). However, the difference in gain of the two classes was not statistically significant ($t = 0.63$, $p > .05$).

Second Grade

The uncorrected average pretest and posttest scores for the control and project classes at each of the three schools are shown in Table 2A.

TABLE 2. AVERAGE ORACY TEST RESULTS FOR THE SECOND GRADE

	SCHOOLS		
	1	2	3
<u>A. UNCORRECTED AVERAGES</u>			
<u>Pretest:</u>			
Control	48.52	55.70	46.22
Project	47.83	51.50	40.70
<u>Posttest:</u>			
Control	52.33	59.09	54.16
Project	66.03	68.05	52.19
<u>B. CORRECTED AVERAGES -- POSTTEST ONLY</u>			
Control	52.44	57.07	54.93
Project	66.34	67.46	54.56
<u>C. DIFFERENCES (PROJECT MINUS CONTROL) -- POSTTEST CORRECTED AVERAGES</u>			
	13.90	10.39	-0.37

The posttest averages, corrected statistically for differences in pretest averages, are shown in Table 2B. Finally, the differences between the averages of the project and control classes at each school are shown in Table 2C. It is apparent from Table 2C that the project classes in schools 1 and 2 improved substantially more than their corresponding control classes. However, the project class in school 3 failed to improve more than its control class. This result came about in part because of the unusually high gains shown by the control class at that school. As shown in Table 1, the control class at school 3 gained twice as much from the pretest to the posttest as the control classes at the other two schools. On the other hand, the project class at school 3 gained somewhat less than the project classes at the other two schools.

The pretest differences among the control and project classes were evaluated by means of an analysis of variance. The summary of this analysis is shown in Table 3. The overall differences between the control and project classes on the pretest were statistically significant ($F = 6.40$, $p < .01$), with the difference favoring the

control classes. The overall differences between schools on the pretest were also statistically significant ($F = 17.87$, $p < .01$).

TABLE 3. SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE -- PRETEST SCORES

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
A Treatment	324.72	1	324.72	6.40	<.01
B Schools	1812.35	2	906.18	17.87	<.01
AB	110.03	2	55.02	1.08	NS
Error	5527.72	109	50.71		

The differences among schools in the pretest (Tables 2A and 3) can be due either to real differences among the students at the schools or to differences in testing and scoring procedures among pairs of examiners (aides), or both. Each pair of examiners tested only at one school. The two schools (2 and 3) in which greatest pretest differences appeared, tend to draw their students from the same socioeconomic and ethnic strata of the community. Hence, it is reasonable to suspect that differences between schools on this test were due, at least in part, to differences among examiners.

The differences among the posttest averages (Table 2B) were evaluated by means of an analysis of covariance. This analysis allows the posttest averages to be corrected statistically for differences in pretest averages. A summary of the analysis of covariance is shown in Table 4. This table shows that the overall differences between the control and project classes were statistically significant ($F = 74.35$, $p < .01$), as were the differences between schools ($F = 56.56$, $p < .01$). There was also a statistically significant interaction between treatment and schools; that is, the differences between the control and project classes were different at different schools.

TABLE 4. SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE -- POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST SCORE AS THE COVARIATE

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
A Treatment	1536.87	1	1536.87	74.35	<.01
B Schools	2338.29	2	1169.15	56.56	<.01
AB	1107.84	2	553.92	26.80	<.01
Error	2231.52	108	30.67		

An additional finding may be cited. Inspection of oracy test averages for each project class showed that the grade 2 classes scored higher on the pretest than did the grade 1 class. The same finding occurred with respect to the posttest. To determine the relative performance of the two grades on each test item, the post-test scores of all grade 2 target students were combined and the average compared with the posttest average of grade 1 target students. The results showed that on 11 of the 15 test items the average post-test score of grade 2 students was significantly larger ($p < .01$) than the average posttest score of grade 1 students. On only one item (No. 5) did the grade 1 average exceed that of grade 2, and in this case the difference was not significant.

THE FREE SPEECH SITUATIONS

The two free speech situations were developed as another way of measuring oracy skill. Hence, their relationship to the oracy test is important. The students in the first and second grades to whom these tests were administered were combined into a single group for analysis. Correlations were obtained between each of the free speech situations and the combined score of each child on the oracy pretest and posttest.¹ The correlation between the first free speech approach and the combined oracy test score was 0.10 ($N=51$). This value is not significantly different from zero, hence there is no relationship between this approach and the oracy test. The correlation between the second free speech approach and the combined oracy test score was 0.42 ($N=46$). This value is significantly different from zero, indicating a positive relationship between the second approach and the oracy test. The correlation between the two free speech situations was 0.26 ($N=48$). This value is not significantly different from zero; hence the two approaches appear to be unrelated.

Although the relationship between the second free speech approach and oracy is positive and significant, it is only moderate in size. This relationship might be improved by improving the standardization of the administration and scoring of the second free speech situation.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

Two project classes in the second grade showed dramatic improvements over their controls as a result of oracy instruction. Thus,

¹Scores on the two tests were combined because it was believed that the combined score would provide a better estimate of oracy skill.

based on these classes, it seems fair to conclude that oracy instruction was an effective means for increasing oracy skills. The project class at school 3 gained somewhat less than the project classes at the other two schools, while the control class at school 3 gained twice as much as the other control classes. Thus, these two conditions combined to mask the apparent effect of oracy instruction at school 3.

Oracy instruction uses materials and activities already used by many teachers in their classrooms. Thus, some control teachers may well evidence more than a minimal level of oracy teaching effectiveness. The intent of the oracy workshop was not to train teachers in completely new classroom practices, but rather to systematize and emphasize practices in which they were already engaging to varying degrees. On this basis, it might be argued that an insufficient number of teachers were used at each school to justify an analysis of the differences between schools. Thus, the differences obtained between schools in this study may be due to chance factors operating in a restricted sample of teachers.

The fourth project class (first grade class) did not gain significantly more than its control, but the findings tended to favor the project class. It may be that first graders aren't able to assimilate oracy instruction to the same extent as second graders. Or it may emphasize the fact that teachers applied the oracy teaching procedures differently in their classrooms. For instance, the first grade teacher tended to practice all students on the same set of teaching activities during each oracy instruction session. Other teachers tended to individualize the instruction so that different students received different exercises depending upon their weaknesses. The individualized approach is a more efficient way of using the students' time, although it is relatively inefficient with regard to the teacher. Other subtle differences in procedure may have been present and should be evaluated if all teachers are to become equally effective.

A final matter is that, although the study showed that oracy instruction can significantly improve oracy skills, the impact of such instruction on the literacy capabilities of students is not known. In other words, a subsequent step in the research program should be to administer the oracy program to groups of target and control students and compare their relative performance on a reading comprehension test.

APPENDIX A

CATEGORIES OF ORACY SKILLS Project ORTRAIN

1. Names Objects: Nouns Only

Given a group of objects (or pictures or models) common in the child's environment, the child will:

- a. Point to an object when it is named by a single noun.
Example: "Point to a car."
- b. Name an object with a single noun when it is pointed out.
Example: "What do you call this?"

2. Describes Objects: Sensory Components

Given a group of objects (or pictures or models) such that each object possesses a unique set of sensory attributes, each of which is shared with at least one other object,* the child will:

- a. Point to an object when its set of sensory attributes is named.
Example: "Point to the small, blue block." (Size, color, shape).
- b. Name the sensory attributes in the set of an object that is pointed out.
Example: "How would you describe this thing?"

3. Describes Objects: Structural Components

Given an object (or picture or model) common in the child's environment and consisting of several structural components, the child will:

- a. Point to a structural component when it is named.
Example: "Point to a wheel."
- b. Name a structural component (nouns only) when it is pointed out.
Example: "What is this part called?"

4. Describes the Sensory Components of Structural Components

Given an object (or picture or model) common in the child's environment and consisting of components with shared sensory attributes, the child will:

- a. Point to a structural component when its set of sensory attributes is named.
Example: "Point to the left, front wheel."

* There may be only one small, blue block, although several other objects may be small or blue or blocks. But no other object has all three attributes.

- b. Name the sensory attributes of a structural component that is pointed out.
Example: "How would you describe this part of this thing?"

5. Describes Objects: Similarities

Given two or more objects (or pictures or models) that have one or more shared attributes, the child will:

- a. Answer "yes" or "no" when asked whether some of the objects are alike with regard to some attribute.
Example: "Are both of these round?"
- b. Name attributes shared by some of the objects.
Example: "How are these two things the same?"

6. Describes Objects: Differences

Given two or more objects (or pictures or models) that have some unshared attributes, the child will:

- a. Answer "yes" or "no" when asked whether the two objects are different with regard to some attribute.
Example: "Are both of these round?"
- b. Name attributes possessed by one object but not by the others.
Example: "How does this differ from those?"

7. Describes Objects: Spatial Relations

Given two common objects, the child will:

- a. Place the objects in spatial relation to each other as directed.
Example: "Put the pencil on the left side of the book."
- b. Name the relationship of one object with respect to the other.
Example: "Where is the pencil?"

8. Describes Objects as Function of Who is Observing

Given a picture in which an object and three observers are present (baby, adult, and animal), the child will:

- a. Indicate which words the baby might use to describe the object.
Example: "Would the baby see this saw as big? long? jaggedy? round? heavy?"
- b. Describe an object as seen by the baby.
Example: "Tell how a baby might describe a pipe wrench?"

9. Describes Object as Function of Internal State of Observer

Given (a) a picture that depicts the internal state of a person, e.g., the person is hungry, cold, etc., and (b) a picture of some object (or its name), the child:

- a. Will select from a list of descriptive words those which the observer might use to describe the object.
Example: "Which of the following do you think the man would use to describe the coat in this (second) picture: (a) scratchy, (b) warm, (c) big, (d) red."
- b. Describes the object by words which are relevant to the internal state of the person.
Example: "Why would this person want the coat?"

10. Describes Object as Function of Location of Observer

Given a picture of some scene, and the instruction to select where the photographer was when he took the picture, the child selects the correct alternative.

- a. Given a list of alternative descriptions of the photographer's location, child selects appropriate description.
Example: "Where was the photographer when he took this picture: (a) above the people? (b) in front of the people? (c) to the left of the ? fat man?, etc."
- b. Given a picture of some scene and the instruction to describe where the photographer was located when he took the picture, the child describes the photographer's (observers) viewpoint in terms of physical relationship to the objects in the picture.
Example: "This is a picture of several people in a street. Where was the photographer when he took this picture?"

11. Describes Events by Sequence

Given an unordered set of steps in the sequence of an event, the child will:

- a. Arrange the steps in correct sequence when asked to do so.
Example: "Arrange these pictures so that they will tell a story."
- b. State the correct order in which the steps in an event should occur.
Example: "In what order does this usually happen?"

Given an event to describe, the child will:

- c. State the sequence of steps in which the event may occur.

Example: "Tell the order of steps to follow in making popcorn."

12. Uses Language in a Social Sense

Given a request for information on how to do something, the child will:

- a. Indicate whether a given answer is acceptable.

Example: "Is this the way to go to get to the principal's office?"

- b. Tell how the person should do it.

Example: "Tell the way to get to the principal's office."

Given the need to do something, the child will:

- c. Indicate who he would ask and what question he would ask.

Example: "Suppose you lost a ball in the playground and can see it through the locked fence. To get it would you contact: a teacher, the principal, a student, the janitor? Would you ask, "Who has my ball? Johnny threw my ball over the fence. Can you unlock the gate for me?"

- d. State the question he would ask someone.

Example: "How can you get into the gym when the door is locked?"

APPENDIX B

Oracy Test

Note:

The following materials are needed to administer the Oracy Test:

Set A - Objects (4 sets of 3 objects)

- 1 small blue car, 1 small red car, 1 large green car
- 1 small red block, 1 large yellow block, 1 large blue block
- 1 small red airplane, 1 medium green, blue, or yellow airplane, 1 large red airplane
- 1 small red ball, 1 medium white ball, 1 large orange ball

Above used for Test Items 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 9.

Set B - Objects

Test Item 3. Eraser, cup, paperbag

Set B - Pictures

- Test Item 4. House
 - 7A. 5 Fruits plus 5 other pictures
 - 7B. 5 Animals plus 5 other pictures
 - 10. Overview of street scene
 - 11. Boy, mower, and man
 - 12. Tables, chairs, cups
 - 13. 4 pictures of boy fishing
 - 14. Circus scene, whole and in pieces
 - 15. No picture required

TEST ITEM 1, SKILL 1: NAMES OF OBJECTS: NOUNS ONLY

Materials: Set A. Lay the objects in a scrambled arrangement in front of the child.

Speaking:

Ask the child to name a class of objects to which you point.

Point to one of the airplanes and ask: "What is this?"

If the child does not name the object correctly, then tell him the correct name. "This is an airplane."

Go on to the next class of objects.

If the child names the object correctly, point to another object in the same class--another airplane. If he is correct again, then go on to the third object in the class. If he is not correct, then go on to the next class of objects.

Repeat the above procedure for two more classes of objects.

Scoring: One point for each object class correctly named by the child. However, the child must name all 3 members of the class correctly in order to receive the one point credit.

TEST ITEM 2, SKILL 2: DESCRIBES OBJECTS: SENSORY COMPONENTS

Materials: Set A. Lay the objects in a scrambled arrangement in front of the child.

Speaking:

Point to a specific object and ask the child to describe it.

Point to the large green car and ask the child, "What is this thing and describe it for me?"

If the child does not name it (i.e., car) and describe at least one modifier, then tell him: "This is the large green car."

If the child names it but doesn't give a modifier, then prompt him.
Ask:

"What color is it?"

or

"How big is it?"

Repeat the above procedure for one more object from a different class.

Scoring: Two points for an object if the child named it and at least one modifier is used and no prompt is given.

One point for an object if the child named and described it with at least one modifier after being prompted.

TEST ITEM 3, SKILL 2: DESCRIBES OBJECTS: SENSORY COMPONENTS

Materials: Set B, Item 3
eraser, paperbag, styrofoam cup

Speaking:

Put an object (eraser) in the paperbag so that the child cannot see into the bag.

Tell the child that he is to put his hand into the bag and feel the object. He is not to look into the bag.

Ask, "Tell me everything you can about the object. You may keep your hand in the bag as long as you like."

Put a styrofoam cup into the bag. Follow same directions as above.

Scoring: One-half point for each attribute mentioned. No prompting please.

TEST ITEM 4, SKILL 3: DESCRIBES OBJECTS: STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS

Materials: Set B, Item 4, picture of house

Speaking:

Show the child a picture of a house. Point to various components and ask, "What is the purpose of this part of the house?" (Point to roof, door, windows, chimney, wall.)

Scoring: One point for each part whose function is correctly stated.

Roof:

"keep out rain"
"to cover house"
"keep out cold"

Chimney:

"let smoke out"
"for fire"
"hold TV antenna"

Door:

"to let people in and out"
"to go through"
"to keep robbers out"

Windows:

"let in light"
"let in air, breeze, wind"
"keep out cold, drafts, bugs"
"so you can see out"

Wall:

"holds up roof"
"keeps out cold"
"keep other people out"

TEST ITEM 5, SKILL 5: DESCRIBES OBJECTS: SIMILARITIES

Materials: Set A. Lay the objects in a scrambled arrangement in front of the child.

Auding:

Ask the child to point to the objects that are the same size and the same color.

"Point to all of the things that are small and red." (Car, airplane, ball, or block.)

If the child does not point to the correct objects, then you point to them and say, "These things are small and red."

Scoring: One-half point for each correct object pointed to by the child.

TEST ITEM 6, SKILL 5: DESCRIBES OBJECTS: SIMILARITIES

Materials: Set A. Lay the objects in a scrambled arrangement in front of the child.

Speaking:

Point to two objects that are the same size and color and ask the child how they are alike. (Note: Point to the car and the ball or the block and the plane. Don't point to the ball and block; don't point to the car and plane.)

"How are these two things the same?"

If the child cannot tell any of the ways in which they are the same, say, "They are both (color)" and "They are both (size)."

If the child names one characteristic but not the other, say to him either:

- (a) "You're right, they are both (color) but they are also both (size)" or
- (b) "You're right, they are both (size) but they are also both (color)."

Then point to two other objects (either the block and plane or the car and ball, depending on which two you pointed to before).

"How are these two things the same?"

Scoring: One point for each characteristic that the child names correctly. No prompting.

TEST ITEM 7, SKILL 5: DESCRIBES OBJECTS: SIMILARITIES

Materials: Set B, Item 7A, 5 pictures of objects--fruits, and Item 7B, 5 pictures of objects--animals.

Auding and Speaking:

Present a set of 10 pictures of objects to the child, making sure that 5 of them are pictures of fruits. (The other 5 should be a buggy, chair, dog, book, spoon.)

Ask, "Pick out the things that are alike in some way." When the child is finished, ask "What do we call all these things?"

If the child can find only 2 or 3 fruits, ask him how they are alike, and show him the ones he missed. Then present a new set of pictures, this time with different objects. (Five animals; the other 5 should be a telephone, clock, car, soup, shirt.) Ask him to pick out the objects that are alike.

If the child can't get started with the first set of pictures, show him the right objects and tell him what they are and how we use them. Then present the second set of 10 pictures. (Five animals and telephone, clock, car, soup, shirt). Ask, "Pick out the things that are alike."

Even if the child answers all questions correctly about the first set of pictures, be sure to present the next set (Five animals). Ask the same questions as before.

Scoring of First Set: One point for identifying at least three objects in the class. An added one-half point for identifying each additional object. One point for naming the class (fruit, things we eat, foods). And one point for telling how the objects are alike (we eat them, they grow on plants).

Scoring of Second Set: One point for identifying at least three objects in the class. An added one-half point for identifying each additional object. One point for naming the class (animals). And one point for telling how the objects are alike (4 legs, heads, tails, etc.).

TEST ITEM 8, SKILL 6: DESCRIBES OBJECTS: DIFFERENCES

Materials: Set A. Arrange large green car, large yellow block, large red airplane, and large orange ball in front of child.

Speaking:

Say to the child, "Tell me about all the ways in which these things are different from each other."

If the child names only one difference, ask, "How else are they different?"

If the child says, "They are different colors" or "They are different shapes," then ask, "What shapes are they?" or "What colors are they?"

Scoring: One point for each dimension of difference (color and shape) and one-quarter point for each specific characteristic named correctly (green, orange, red, yellow).

TEST ITEM 9, SKILL 7: DESCRIBES OBJECTS: SPATIAL RELATIONS

Materials: Large green car and large yellow block from Set A plus a book and pencil.

Speaking:

Arrange the objects in front of the child. Place the pencil on top of the block.

Ask, "Where is the pencil?"

If the child doesn't know, tell him, "It is on top of the block."

Then (1) place the pencil under the block, (2) then between the block and the book, (3) then behind the book from the child's point of view, (4) then beside the book with no other objects on the other side of the pencil. No prompting.

Scoring: One point for each correct response. The child must use words to indicate the location of the pencil; merely pointing is inadequate.

TEST ITEM 10, SKILL 7: DESCRIBES OBJECTS: SPATIAL RELATIONS

Materials: Set B, Item 10

Speaking:

Show the aerial picture of the town to the child.

Ask, "Billy lives in a white house with a blue roof. How far does Billy live from the candy store? Do not point. Tell me in words."

Then ask, "How would Joan get from school to the parking lot? Do not point. Tell me in words."

Scoring: One point for each correct answer.

Possible answers:

Billy: about a block, 1 block

Joan: Any combination of words and pointing to show that child uses streets, sidewalks, yards, or paths to get to the right place. Can't go thru or over buildings.

TEST ITEM 11, SKILL 8: DESCRIBES OBJECTS AS A FUNCTION OF WHO IS
OBSERVING

Materials: Set B, Item 11

Speaking:

Show the child the picture of the boy, the man, and the lawn mower.

Ask, "If the boy tried to push the mower, how do you think it would feel to him?" (Hard to push, too high, too big, heavy, can't do.)

Then ask, "If the man tried to push it, how would it feel to him?" (Easy to push, light, easy to handle.)

Scoring: Two points if the child can tell one way the mower would feel to the boy and two points if the child can tell one way it would feel to the man.

TEST ITEM 12, SKILL 10: DESCRIBES OBJECTS AS A FUNCTION OF LOCATION
OF OBSERVER

Materials: Set B, Item 12, views.

Speaking:

Show the child the pictures.

Then point to the upper left objects and say, "This is the way a table, chair, and cup usually look to you."

Then point to one of the other views and ask: "Who would see the table this way--a bird or a worm?"

Then proceed to each of the other views in the same manner.

Scoring: One point for each correct answer out of the six opportunities.

TEST ITEM 13, SKILL 11: DESCRIBES EVENTS BY SEQUENCE

Materials: Set B, Item 13, sequence

Speaking:

Arrange the pictures before the child in sequence as numbered on the back. Number 1 should be to the child's left.

Then say, "These pictures tell a story if they are put in the right order. See if you can put them in the right order?"

When the child is through, ask him to tell a story about the pictures.

Scoring: Score one point for each picture he mentions in correct sequence in his story. As long as the child tells a sensible story, he gets one point for each picture whatever the arrangement of pictures.

TEST ITEM 14, SKILL 12: USES LANGUAGE IN A SOCIAL SENSE

Materials: Set B, Item 14

Speaking:

Give the child the picture of the circus scene. Lay out the cut-up pieces of the scene in front of you.

Ask, "Look at the picture you have. Look at the pieces in front of me. Now tell me how to put the pieces together so that they make a whole picture like yours. Do not show me the whole picture and do not point to any of the pieces. Tell me in words what to do."

Scoring: One-half point for each piece that connects with another piece.

(If little progress is made after 2-3 minutes,
go on to next item.)

TEST ITEM 15, SKILL 12: USES LANGUAGE IN SOCIAL SENSE

Materials: None

Speaking:

Ask, "Tell me what you do each day from the time you wake up until you get to school."

Scoring: One point for each event that is mentioned.

ORACY EXAMINATION SCORE SHEET

Examiner _____

(5) Total

Item 4

DESCRIBES OBJECTS:
STRUCTURAL
COMPONENTS
(Speaking)

a. ROOF _____(1)
b. DOOR _____(1)
c. WINDOWS _____(1)
d. CHIMNEY _____(1)
e. WALL _____(1)

(5) Total _____

Item 5

DESCRIBES OBJECTS:
SIMILARITIES
(Auding)

SMALL AND RED
a. Car _____(1/2)
b. Airplane _____(1/2)
c. Ball _____(1/2)
d. Block _____(1/2)

(2) Total _____

Item 6

DESCRIBES OBJECTS:
SIMILARITIES
(Speaking)

a. _____

(1) color _____(1)
(2) size _____(1)
b. _____

(1) color _____(1)
(2) size _____(1)

(4) Total _____

Item 7

DESCRIBES OBJECTS:
SIMILARITIES
(Auding and Speaking)

A. FRUITS
3 objects _____(1)
4th object _____(1/2)
5th object _____(1/2)
Class name _____(1)
How alike _____(1)

(4) Total _____

B. ANIMALS
3 objects _____(1)
4th object _____(1/2)
5th object _____(1/2)
Class name _____(1)
How alike _____(1)

(4) Total _____

Item 8
DESCRIBES OBJECTS:
DIFFERENCES
(Speaking)

DIMENSIONS

Color _____ (1)
Shape _____ (1)

SPECIFICS

Colors _____ (1/4 each)
Shapes _____ (1/4 each)

(4) Total _____

Item 9
DESCRIBES OBJECTS:
SPATIAL RELATIONS
(Speaking)

a. On top of block _____ (1)
b. Under block _____ (1)
c. Between block &
book _____ (1)
d. Beside book _____ (1)

(4) Total _____

Item 10
DESCRIBES OBJECTS:
SPATIAL RELATIONS
(Speaking)

Candy Store _____ (1)
Parking Lot _____ (1)

(2) Total _____

Item 11
DESCRIBES OBJECTS:
POINT OF VIEW
WHO OBSERVES
(Speaking)

a. Boy push mower _____ (2)
b. Man push mower _____ (2)

(4) Total _____

Item 12
DESCRIBES OBJECTS:
POINT OF VIEW
LOCATION OF
OBSERVER
(Speaking)

BIRD OR WORM

a. _____ (1)
b. _____ (1)
c. _____ (1)
d. _____ (1)
e. _____ (1)
f. _____ (1)

(6) Total _____

Item 13
DESCRIBES EVENTS
BY SEQUENCE
(Speaking)

PICTURES mentioned
in correct sequence

a. _____ (1)
b. _____ (1)
c. _____ (1)
d. _____ (1)

(4) Total _____

Item 14
USFS LANGUAGE IN
SOCIAL SENSE:
DIRECTING ANOTHER
(Speaking)

Number of
connecting pieces

____(1/2)

(4) Total ____

Item 15
USES LANGUAGE IN
SOCIAL SENSE
(Speaking)

Out of bed
Puts on clothes
Washes
Eats breakfast
Leaves house
Walks to school
Plays with friends
Arrives at school
Other

____(1)
____(1)
____(1)
____(1)
____(1)
____(1)
____(1)
____(1)
____(1)

(9) Total ____